DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 845 RE 003 920

AUTHOR Sweiger, Jill D.
TITLE Designs and Organizational Structure of Junior and Community College Reading Programs Across the Nation.
PUB DATE Dec 71
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Tampa, Fla., Dec. 1971
AVAILABLE FROM National Reading Conference, Inc., Marquette University, 1217 W. Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis. 53233

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; Conference Reports; Course Content; Course Organization; Diagnostic Tests; Instructional Materials; *Junior Colleges; *National Surveys; *Questionnaires; *Reading Programs; Student Enrollment; Teacher Background

ABSTRACT

A 34-item questionnaire was sent to 823 junior and community colleges across the nation to collect information about their reading programs. Of the 378 responses, 288 were used in this study. The survey revealed a high degree of similarity within the reading courses at these colleges as illustrated in the following. (1) Students are admitted through three main criteria: referral, student selection, and results of entrance exams. (2) Most of the faculty members hold graduate degrees in English or are reading specialists, and 99 percent of them accept some diagnostic testing responsibilities. (3) Standardized reading tests are given to entering students and at the end of the course; the most frequently used test is the Nelson Denny Reading Test. (4) Fifty percent of the schools reported maximum class size to be 20 to 25 students, and the total instructional hours range from 2 to 5 hours per week. (5) The course content is primarily the basic reading skills; sometimes speed reading and study skills are also included. Major differences between the school reading programs are primarily related to the mechanics of organization of the courses such as credits offered, hours of instruction, number of courses, reading ability of students, grading system, and affiliation of the course with other divisions of the school. Tables, references, and appendixes are included. (AW)

ED056845

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
the National Reading Conference
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

DESIGNS AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE READING PROGRAMS ACROSS THE NATION

A Paper

Presented to

The National Reading Conference

Tampa, Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Jill D. Sweiger

December 1971

RE003 920

Introduction

The junior-community college is a distinct educational entity in the United States today. Its uniqueness has been recognized by many who have devoted research time to this instructional level, and now much information is available regarding the purposes, history and development of these schools.

If we are able to make general statements concerning these aspects of the junior-community college, perhaps there are some national similarities within the curriculum of these schools which can be identified.

One general trend which has frequently been discussed in papers relating to the development of the junior-community college curriculum is that of the inclusion of remedial education. The mere recognition that this type of education is being offered by a large percentage of these two-year institutions is not the same as determining whether remedial education is the same for all schools in all places.

This study focuses on one branch of remedial education: reading.

Many studies have been conducted on a local and regional scale which describe reading courses on the two-year college level. And several studies have been conducted on a national scale to determine the nature of reading instruction at the university level or combined two- and four-year college levels. But this author has not been able to find any study conducted to determine national trends in reading education which looks solely at our two-year colleges. Selected references for these other studies of reading courses as well as those relating to the development of the junior college are listed in Appendix B.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to provide, through a collection of information on a nationwide scale, background upon which the following activities can be conducted at the two-year college level: development of guidelines for structuring new reading courses; analysis of reading courses already in existence by providing perspective to those teaching and administering them; and utilization of a frame of reference for those teaching reading who have had little or no educational background in this field.

This study will focus on the current status of two-year college reading programs at 288 schools in 30 states with regards to three major categories:

1. The relation of the reading courses to the rest of the school.
2. The process of student enrollment in the reading courses.
3. The nature of the reading courses.

It is expected that a great number of similarities will be found in the way reading programs have developed with regards to course content and the relation of the program to the rest of the school. It is also expected that numerous diversifications will be found in the way the courses are organized which give the courses their individual identity.

No implication is made that because many schools may be doing some things in the same way, that this is the most effective way. That is another question not looked at here.

Procedures

During February 1971 a thirty-four item questionnaire was developed. It was given to fellow faculty members and administrators for evaluation. Following this several revisions were made and a cover letter was prepared explaining the purpose of the study. These items were initially sent to 35 instructors of reading who attended a session on junior and community colleges at the National Reading Conference, December 1970, and who had expressed an interest in such a questionnaire being developed. On the basis of the immediate response received to this trial send-out, additional questionnaires were sent to the "Director of the Reading Clinic" at 823 two-year colleges across the country listed in the American Association of Junior Colleges 1971 directory. 378 were returned between April and July 1971. Of these, 288 from 30 states were used in the study. Of those eliminated, 69 indicated the college had no reading course and 21 were received from states returning 3 or fewer. It is felt that those remaining questionnaires used in the study are representative geographically, politically, economically and socially of junior and community colleges across the nation.

Observations on Incoming Data

Not all schools returning the questionnaire had reading courses which was in itself informative. The questionnaires in these cases most often was directed to one of the college administrators, some of whom inidcated in their returns that the school would soon be starting a course and that they would like a copy of these findings for direction. Some other respondents supplied brochures, course outlines or other printed material to help describe their programs. Many respondents wrote that they were anxious to receive my information,

thereby indicating a need for this study. Several asked for information on the National Reading Conference. Most questionnaires were returned within the first six weeks. Some states, such as New York and North Carolina, were generally much faster than others in returning their responses. Later returns were not as detailed as earlier ones. Perhaps the later returns were a part of the end-of-the-school-year desk cleaning.

Statistical Design

After preliminary screening of the incoming questionnaires to elimimate responses from schools which did not have reading courses, tabulations of responses by states and calculation of percentage responses by state were made. Those states having three or fewer responses were eliminated from the balance of the study. This was followed by calculation of national response by item to show relative response giving equal weight to each institution. As a final step responses were charted to visually identify significant similarities or differences.

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation relates to the nature of the questionnaire itself. Many items could have been answered descriptively reather than "yes", "no", but this writer felt that asking for this type of response would have considerably reduced the number of items to be included. A few items were ambiguous and open to several interpretations. This was indicated by the variety of types of answers received. Some items were responded to similarly, by the writer realizes that the meaning for two respondents giving the same reply might be quite different; e.g. when describing their relationship with the counseling division two respondents might have answered "close"; to one this could mean counselors do much referring of students, while to another it might mean team planning of programs, analysis of students' needs, etc. Some items, although answered, might have been loosely interpreted; e.g. in responding to the item on admissions tests used by the college, most schools gave names of tests, and, although often it was otherwise indicated that many of these tests were used solely as placement tools, this was not always clear in the response.

The time factor places another limitation on this study. 'Change' is very characteristic of much, and particularly swiftly expanding areas, of education. This study reports results of courses offered from 1970-71. A number of schools reported that changes were being considered for the coming year.

The third limitation of the study is related to representation of individual schools within the study. The data in this study has been organized into political divisions, by state, which may not reflect the population of the student body attending two-year colleges within that state.

TABLE I

ENTRANCE CRITERIA FOR READING COURSES

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE BY STATE

Course Admission Procedures	Alabama	Arizona	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Illinois	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Nebraska	New Jersey	New York	North Carolina	Ohio	Oklahoma	Pennsylvania	Texas	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Wyoming
a. Placement Tests	50	75	50	25	100	77	63	100	39	57	11	33	63	83	46	50	83	57	25	100	63	100	17	67	100	63	60	14		50
b. Requirement	13	25	21		67	8	63	25		29		33	25	33	9		50	43		40	26		33		29	15	20	7		
c. Elective	87		48	100	33	54	13	75	89	57	100	67	25	67	55	100	67	57	75	20	26		67	67		71	80	78	100	100
d. High School Grades	13	75				23	13						25		18						11			33			20	64		25
e. Referral		50	54	75		8	25	25	17	86	56		25	50	64	100	50		100	60	52		17	33	29	46	100		20	100
Percent Using Combination of Two or More	38	75	52	75	100	54	75	75	44	86	56	33	38	67	64		100	29	75	100	63		33		58	63	100	43	20	100

Findings

Commonalities

There is a high degree of similarity within the reading courses at two-year colleges with regards to procedures for admitting a student into the course, faculty educational background, diagnostic procedures, maximum class size, course content, and inservice activities conducted by reading instructors.

The three criteria repeatedly mentioned as being the basis on which a student is admitted into the course are referral, student election, and the results of entrance exams. These criteria are used by 37%, 55%, and 56% of the schools respectively with 49% using a combination of two or more criteria including the ones mentioned above and/or high school grades and requirement. Table I illustrates the breakdown of these criteria. Although 69% indicated that the course is elective or open to all students a smaller percentage reported this as a means by which a student enrolls in the course. 83% of the colleges reported that they administer a test at the time of student admission to the college which, used as a placement tool, serves to identify students students needing a course in reading. Many of these schools specified a predetermined cut-off point on the test ranging from the lower 50th percentile to the bottom 25th percentile below which a student would be required or strongly encouraged to take reading. The most popular test for admission and placement purposes is the American College Test being used by 42% of the schools. Schools indicating use of a cut-off score for reading generally referred to the Nelson-Denny which was given as a part of the school admission procedures.

The educational background of the faculty teaching reading was determined by asking, "How many full-time faculty members teaching reading hold graduate degrees in reading, English, or areas not related to reading." Returns

indicated 38% have degrees in English and 47% are reading specialists. Within some states there is consistency in this regard; for example in Maryland 100% of the instructors are reading specialists.

The diagnostic testing procedures inquiry was limited to determining what, if any, standardized reading tests are used when a student enters the course. Such a test is used by 92% with those most frequently mentioned being the Nelson Denny (46%) and the Triggs Diagnostic Reading Tests- Survey Section, Upper Level (22%). The standardized reading test is administered again at the end of the course in 82% of the schools.

Class size was ascertained by inquiring as to maximum size, minimum size, and faculty-pupil ratios. The most common element was the maximum per class size of 20-25 reported by 50% of the schools.

Similarities in course content could be inferred from the content of books specified as required for student purchase or selected for classroom resources, and hardware maintained in the room for student use. There is a wide diversity in the choice of materials required for student purchase, but those most frequently mentioned are listed in Appendix C. More than 75% of the schools reported that students are required to purchase books. Despite the variations in choice, all the books selected focus primarily on the basic reading skills of general and interpretive comprehension and vocabulary development. In addition some include sections on building speed in reading and on study skills. Many schools indicated that in-class materials are too numerous to list individually, but Appendix D outlines those most often mentioned by those schools which did specify. Once again the materials selection emphasizes the basic reading skills previously described. The most frequently identified hardware being maintained in the classroom for student use is listed in Appendix E. Only a very small number of schools indicated that no machines are available; the majority

TABLE II

COURSE CREDITS AWARDED IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

READING COURSES

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE BY STATE

Course Credit Received	Alabama	Arizona	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Illinois	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Nebraska	New Jersey	New York	North Carolina	Ohio	Oklahoma	Pennsylvania	Texas	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Wyoming
a. No Credit	14				100	7	43		5	29			75	57	11		33			40	43	41	17		37	8		8	33	
b. 1	29	25	7			29	29		11	29	38		13	15	11	50	17	15	67			12	17			15				25
c. 2	14	25	29	50		14			42	29	38	75	25		33		17	29			29			25		8	20	38		
d. 3	43	50	69	25		57		100	26		13	25		15	45	50	33	29	33		14	29	17	50	13	72	40	38	33	50
e. Non-Applicable Credit			7			14			11	14			13	15	22			43		60	14	18	40	25	50		60	38		25
f. Variable Credit			16	25		7	29		11	13												6						8	33	
g. Different Credit for Different Courses			27			29			5				25		11			15			5	6					20			

reported the equipment is used one or two times per week on both a group and individual basis, with an individual student sometimes being permitted to use it more frequently.

In 82% of the cases it was reported that students are taught study skills in the reading course, and 22% listed this as a separate course offering. Team teaching activities are reported by only 27% and 32% indicated they have conducted in-service sessions for members of the college faculty and/or staff.

51% of the schools reported that tutorial services were provided by the college not including the reading course itself.

Differences

The non-commonalities of reading courses in two-year colleges throughout the United States are primarily related to the mechanics of organization of the courses. They relate to such areas as course credits, frequency of course meetings, number of reading courses offered, course titles, grading practices, materials selection, relationship between reading instructors and counseling services of the school, department affiliation of the course and ability levels of entering students.

Students in reading courses at two-year colleges may receive anywhere from 0-5 credits. The most common element was 36% giving 3 credits and 21% giving 2 credits. Some schools offer variable credits, and 14% of the schools give credit for the course but the credit is not applicable to graduation. The breakdown of credit arrangements is illustrated in Table II. One school reported giving advanced credit to a student whose reading skills permit him to be exempt from an all-school required reading course. Another school indicated that credits for the reading course are applied towards a student's English credit requirements.

Class meetings range from 1 to 5 days per week with total instruction-

TABLE III

LOWEST READING GRADE LEVELS* OF STUDENTS AT TIME OF

ENTRANCE TO READING COURSE

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE BY STATE

Lowest Reading Level of Students Entering Course	Alabama	Arizona	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Illinois	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Nebraska	New Jersey	New York	North Carolina	Ohio	Oklahoma	Pennsylvania	Texas	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Wyoming
a. 3 or Below		17	53		40	42	13	50	29	17	13		33	50	45		40	11		25	6	11		29		36	20	50	100	50
b. 4-5	17		22			8	25		29		38		33		11	50	20	45	100	50	24	39	50	14		27	20	21		
c. 6-7	67	67	22	100	40	42	50	50	41	67	25	67	33	50	45	50	20	45		25	59	28	50	29		36	60	21		50
d. 8-9	17	17	11		20	8	13				13	33					20				12	17		29				7		
e. 10-11			5							17	13											5								

* As determined by standardized achievement and/or reading tests.

al hours from 2 to 5 hours per week. 41% of the schools report the classes meet for a total of 3 hours 3 days per week. 66% of the schools are on a semester system and 29% are on a quarter system, but there is no consistency in the frequency of meetings per week as related to the type of system the school follows.

While the majority of schools (60%) offer only one reading course, the percent offering more were as follows:

2 courses:	19%	4 courses:	2%
3 courses:	8%	5 courses:	1%

The primary distinction between the courses in schools offering more than one course is the reading ability for which the course is designed. In 3% of the cases no formal course is offered but there is a learning lab where students can work individually on both reading and study skills.

The minimum class size reported ranged from 1 to 20 students per class.

A plethora of course titles was reported and these are listed alphabetically in Appendix F. An examination of these reveals that within many of the titles themselves there is an indication of the reading ability for which the course is geared. In some cases the subject matter or teaching approach can also be ascertained.

The range of reading abilities of students enrolled in the reading courses, as measured by standardized reading tests, varies considerably from school to school. 90% of the schools reported receiving students who are reading below 8th grade level at the time of course entrance. Table III illustrates the breakdown by grade level. Some schools having more than one course reported two different entering levels.

It was reported by 65% of the schools that they were affiliated with the English division of their college. In some of these cases the English

TABLE IV

DIVISION AFFILIATION OF READING COURSES

AT TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE BY STATE

Division Affiliation	Alabama	Arizona	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Illinois	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Nebraska	New Jersey	New York	North Carolina	Ohio	Oklahoma	Pennsylvania	Texas	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Wyoming
a. Own		50	4	50		14	14		25	14	33		13	17			33			7	12			33	18		7	17		
b. English (Humanities, etc.)	100	50	79	25	33	29	57	100	60	43	33	100	75	33	89	75	33	100	67	80	76	53	67	67	58	64	20	73	17	50
c. Directed Studies, etc.			2	25		36	14		15				13			25	17		33		7	24	33		14		80		50	25
d. Psychology, etc.			11		33					14															14	18			17	
e. Student Affairs, etc.			4		33						22			50																25
f. Vocational Technology						23											20								14					
g. Other							14			28	11				11				20		12									

TABLE V

GRADING SYSTEMS USED IN READING COURSES

AT TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE BY STATE

Grading System Used for Course	Alabama	Arizona	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Illinois	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Nebraska	New Jersey	New York	North Carolina	Ohio	Oklahoma	Pennsylvania	Texas	Virginia	Washington	Wisconsin	Wyoming
a. A-D + W	29		20		33	33	13	25		17	14				9					16	6				17		14			
b. A-F	71	25	41	50		33	63	25	79	50	43	75	57	33	55	50	83	100	50	20	37	63	67	100	50	73	40	57	50	33
c. SRU, etc.						8	13	25	5						9					40	26				13		80			
d. C/NC, PF, SU		25	25		67	8	13		21		14	25	43	33	18	25	17		25	40	10	19	17		38			14		67
e. ABC, W, INC.		50	16			25				33	29											6	17					7		
f. P or Nothing				25				25								25														
g. ABC, NC, I			7	25																								7		
h. None														33	9				25		16	13			13				25	
i. Choice (Incl. above)			14																									22		
j. Different Types for Different Courses			9			8			5				14								5	6			13		20		25	

division was part of a much larger Humanities division. Other affiliations included Psychology (3%), Vocational-Technical (2%), Student Affairs (5%), Directed Studies (11%). Only 11% of the reading courses are in a division of their own as can be seen from Table IV.

A wide variety of grading systems are employed in the reading courses at two-year junior and community colleges, with 66% indicating that the system used is the same as that used by the rest of the school. Table V illustrates the percentages of schools using each type. It should be noted that the criteria for achieving any of the grades was not determined.

The relationship the reading instructors have with the counseling staff of the college was generally reported as either 'close', 'some', 'none', 'referral', or 'counselor is part of the reading course' with the breakdown on this item as follows:

'close': 33% 'none': 14%

'some': 11% 'referral': 33%

'counselor is part of the reading course': 8%

As a final item respondents were asked to determine whether the nature of their course is primarily developmental, corrective, or remedial. 32% identified their courses as developmental, 13% responded corrective, and 12% viewed their courses as primarily remedial. In addition, 7% determined their courses to be a combination of developmental and corrective, 3% as a combination of developmental and remedial, while 42% indicated that their course cut across all these areas.

Conclusions

This study was conducted to determine whether there existed, on a national scale, any general trends in reading courses being offered at two-year junior and community colleges. A questionnaire was designed and sent to 823 schools across the country. Of the 378 returned, 288 from 30 states were used in this study. Based on these responses, the following conclusions can be made:

1. The preponderence of reading courses at two-year junior and community colleges across the nation indicates an administrative recognition and acceptance of the need for such instruction, even at this educational level.

2. A number of similarities exist in reading courses at two-year junior-community colleges in the United States. These similarities are primarily related to an evident agreement among instructors and publishers of reading instruction material for this level that many entering freshmen require training in the basic skills of reading. It appears that to a large degree the materials available are determining what is being taught. For the instructor having no education in reading instruction, this may be regarded as at least a security blanket.

3. It is not appropriate to speak in generalities when discussing designs of reading courses at two-year junior and community colleges in the United States. The diversities which exist appear to be related to the nature of the individual college: its budget, its locality, its size and its philosophy towards the entire concept of remedial education. These variables directly influence the organization of the reading courses and account for most of the uniquenesses from school to school.

4. Most of the reading courses offered at these institutions are designed for the student to take as a freshman to prepare him for his years ahead in college. Study skills are seen as a fundamental part of this preparation.

5. Textbook selections and course titles indicate that emphasis is not on teaching speed in reading, but rather on the basic reading skills including vocabulary and comprehension development.

6. Either by use of a different grading system, by not allowing course credit to be applied towards graduation, or by not giving any credit at all, the reading courses are generally identified as something less than college level work.

7. Many schools indicated changed planned for their reading courses for the 1971-72 school year. The changes focused primarily on the number of courses offered,credit arrangements and textbook selection. This indicates an ongoing evaluation of the reading courses in many of the schools where they are being conducted.

8. Regardless of the educational background of the instructor, 99% of the instructors teaching reading courses have accepted some diagnostic testing responsibilities.

9. The multitude of division affiliations of the reading courses in our two-year colleges is perhaps the result of the comprehensive nature of reading itself--it cuts across all areas of learning and, consequently, to place it in one division may be just as effective as to place it in another.

Recommendations

1. A bi-yearly examination of the state of reading programs on a nationwide scale would serve to identify specific problems and relate innovations on a regular basis.

2. There must be an all-out effort on the part of faculty members teaching reading to get status for their courses. This would include acquiring course credit for graduation and grading systems that do not stigmatize the course.

3. There should be establishment of professional accredidation for teachers of reading as there is in the content fields. All instructors should have at least a minimal amount of course work in reading which would include diagnostic testing techniques.

4. Student progress tends to be illustrated in terms of his improved scores on diagnostic reading tests. The meaningfulness of this approach is open to question and has been examined by many including Farr and Anastasiow (2) and Brigham (1). Instructors need to be concerned with the degree to which the skills taught in reading are transferred to other subjects and what the long term effects of reading courses on student achievement in college are. This information can be obtained by means of follow-up studies.

5. Instructors of reading courses should become more involved with planning in teams of counselors, content area instructors and reading specialists. In fact, the reading instructor may find he will have to take the initiative in this endeavor.

6. More instruction in reading skills should be related to specific content areas rather than be taught as isolated drills provided by publishers of materials for reading instruction.

7. Diagnostic testing and profile analysis on all entering freshmen should be conducted and criteria established for identifying students needing reading instruction. To do this, the school must first determine what types of abilities students will require in order to be successful in the various courses of study offered at the particular college. In addition it must be considered carefully whether the instrument used is valid as a predictor of academic achievement.

8. Additional private or extremely small classes should be available for the student who is severely retarded in reading. As long as community colleges remain "open door" they have the responsibility to provide for the tremendous ranges of ability entering these schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brigham, Bruce W. "Standardized Tests -- Muses and Their Meanings," Journal of the Reading Specialist, IX (March, 1970), pp. 104-110 and 114.

2. Farr, Roger and Anastasiow, Nicholas., Tests of Reading Readiness and Achievement: A Review and Evaluation. Delaware: International Reading Association, 1969, p. 5.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. YOUR NAME_____

2. Name of College_____

3. College Address_____

4. (Circle one) 2 year college 4 year college

5. Does this college have an open admissions policy? _____

6. What restrictions, if any, are placed on admissions?

7. What tests, if any, are used as entrance exams for the college?

8. Does your college have a reading improvement course?_____ *Course Title_____

*IF YOUR ANSER IS 'NO', PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO THE ADDRESS BELOW.

9. Briefly describe by whom and on what basis a student is selected for admission into the course.

10. Is this reading course part of some other division or department on campus? _____
If yes, please give division or department_____

11. How many full-time faculty members teach the reading course?_____ Part time?____

12. Is there an additional course for teaching study skills? If yes, please describe briefly how a student is admitted:

13. Is study skills taught as a part of the reading course?_____

14. How many full-time faculty members teaching reading hold graduate degrees as:
reading specialists_____
English majors_____
In fields not relevant to the teaching of reading_____

15. What standardized tests, if any, are administered to the students when they first enter the course:

16. Are these administered again at the end of the semester (quarter)?_____

17. How many days per week does this course meet? _____Hourse per week?_____

18. Are you on a semester, tri-semester, quarter or other type system? (Give type)_____

19. What is the maximum enrollment size?____ Minimum? ____ Faculty-pupil ratio? ____
Approximately how many students enroll each quarter/semester?_____

20. How many credits does the student receive for this course?_____ Are these credits applicable towards graduation?_____

21. Is this course elective?_____(If no, please explain)

APPENDIX A (cont'd)

22. What kind of grade system is used for this course?_____

23. Is this the same type of grading system that is used in the rest of the school?____

24. How long has this course been in existence?_____

25. Are any teaching machines used in this course?_____(If yes, please specify and indicate if used on a group or individual basis and how often they are used.)

26. Do students purchase textbooks for this course? (Please specify which ones.)

27. Are any published materials kept in the classroom for students to use on a regular basis? (If yes, please specify.)

28. What is the approximate range of reading levels in your course?_____
What is the average reading level of students in your course_____

29. Are tutorial services in reading, other than the reading course itself, provided by the college?_____

30. Does your reading laboratory serve any other functions than as a base for the reading course?_____If yes, please describe briefly.

31. Please describe briefly what, if any, relationship has been established between the faculty of your reading course and the counseling services of your school.

32. Have the faculty members of the reading course done any team teaching?_____
(if yes, please describe briefly).

33. Have the faculty members of the reading course held any in-service sessions for members of the faculty in other departments?_____

34. Would you classify your course as primarily (Please check one of the choices below)
Developmental- improving already existing skills_____
Corrective - working on particular weaknesses of students_____
Remedial - giving instruction in the basis skills of reading such as phonics analysis and other word attack skills_____ to students reading several years below grade level

Other - Please explain briefly

Please return the completed questionnaire to:
Mrs. Jill Sweiger, Asst. Prof. of Reading
Division of Developmental Studies
Northern Virginia Community College

APPENDIX B

List of Relevant Publications

Causey, Oscar L., "College Reading Programs in the Nation," in Oscar S. Causey (Ed.), Exploring the Goals of College Reading Programs, Fifth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, Texas Christian University Press, Texas, 1956, pp. 135-137.

Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968. 151 pp.

Lowe, A.J., "State Survey of College Reading Improvement Services," in Ralph C. Staiger and Culbreth Melton (Eds.), New Developments in Programs and Procedure for College Adult Reading, Twelfth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, The Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1963, pp. 85-86.

Witty, Paul A., "Practices in Corrective Reading in Colleges and Universities," School and Society, 52: 564-568, November 30, 1940.

Woods, R. Keith, "A Survey of Reading Programs in Wisconsin," in Oscar S. Causey (Ed.), Techniques and Procedures in College and Adult Reading Programs, Sixth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for College and Universities, Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas, 1957, pp. 134-138.

Yarrington, Roger (ed.). Junior Colleges: 50 States/50 Years. Washington D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969. 297 pp.

APPENDIX C

Most Frequently Mentioned Materials for Student Purchase

(Listed Alphabetically by Title)

1. The Art of Efficient Reading. Berg and Spache. MacMillan Co., New York City, New York.
2. Basic Vocabulary Skills. Davis. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York City, New York.
3. Breaking the Reading Barrier. Wilcox and Gilbert. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
4. Efficient Reading. Brown. D.C. Heath & Co., Boston, Mass.
5. Free To Read - A Guide to Effective Reading. Bamman, Hiyama, and Prescott. Field Educational Publications, San Francisco, Calif.
6. How to Study. Preston and Botel. Science Research Associates, Inc. Chicago, Illinois.
7. How to Study in College. Pauk. Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass.
8. Improving College Reading. Jacobus. Harcourt-Brace-Janovitch Inc., New York City, New York.
9. Improving Reading Ability. Stroud. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York City, New York.
10. Increasing Reading Efficiency. Miller. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., New York City, New York.
11. Increasing Reading Speed. Adams. MacMillan Co., New York City, New York.
12. Opportunity for Skillful Reading. Joffee. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Belmont, Calif.
13. Programed Vocabulary. Brown. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. New York City, New York.
14. Successful Reading: Key to Our Dynamic Society. Norman. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., New York City, New York.
15. Tactics in Reading, Books I, II, and III. Niles, et.al. Scott Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois.
16. Toward Reading Comprehension. Sherbourne. D.C. Heath & Co., Boston, Mass.

APPENDIX C (cont'd)

17. The Turning Point in Reading. Gilbert. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

18. Vocabulary 1000. Cronin. Harcourt-Brace-Janovitch, Inc., New York City, New York.

19. Word Clues, Books G-M. E.D.L./McGraw-Hill, Huntington, New York.

20. World of Ideas- A Guide to Effective Reading. Bamman, Hiyama, and Prescott. Field Educational Publications, San Francisco, Calif.

APPENDIX D

Most Frequently Mentioned Materials Kept in Classroom for Student Use *

(Listed Alphabetically)

1. Activities for Reading Improvement (Just for Fun Series). Schuchter and Whelan. Steck-Vaughn Co., Austin, Texas.
2. Basic Skills System. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York City, New York.
3. Be A Better Reader Books, Levels I-V. Smith. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
4. Better Reading, Books 1 and 2. Simpson. Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.
5. Effective Listening. Xerox Corporation, New York City, New York.
6. Listen and Read. E.D.L./McGraw-Hill, Huntington, New York.
7. Reader's Digest and Reader's Digest Skill Builders. Reader's Digest Services, Inc., Pleasantville, New York.
8. Reading for Understanding. Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.
9. Reading Laboratory Series. Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.
**10. Selections from the Black. Spargo, ed. Jamestown Publishers. Providence, Rhode Island.
11. Tactics I, II and III. Niles, et. al. Scott Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois.

ALSO: Magazines, Newspapers, and paperback books.

* Most schools indicated a library of materials too numerous to list.

** Only ethnic literature reported.

APPENDIX E

Most Frequently Mentioned Hardware

(Listed Alphabetically)

Accelerators, Pacers and Rateometers

Controlled Readers and Controlled Reader Juniors

Craig Readers

Language Masters

*ALSO:

Hoffman Readers

Perceptoscopes

Projectos and Filmstrips

Reading Eye Cameras

Recordings

Shadowscopes

Skimmer and Scanners

Tachistoscopes, T-Matics, Tach-X's

Tape Recorders

* Mentioned less frequently but often

APPENDIX F

Course Titles

(Listed Alphabetically)

* Indicates this title was selected by 5 or more schools.

** Indicates this title was selected by 10 or more schools.

Academic Skills
Accelerated Reading
Adult Basic and G.E.D.
Adult Short Term Speed Reading
Advanced College Reading
Advanced College Reading Techniques
Advanced Critical and Evaluative Thinking
*Advanced Reading
Advanced Reading and Study Skills
Advanced Reading Skills
Advanced Techniques of Reading

Basic Communication Skills
Basic English
*Basic Reading
Basic Reading and Study Skills
Basic Reading Skills
Basic Skills
Basic Skills--Remedial Reading

Clinical Reading
College Developmental Reading
College Preparatory Reading
College Reading
College Reading and Study
College Reading and Study Skills
College Reading Skills
College Reading Techniques
Communications
Communications Lab
Communications Skills
Communications Skills Center
Critical and Evaluative Thinking
Critical Reading
Critical Reading and Thinking
Critical Reading Improvement

APPENDIX F (cont'd)

Developmental Communications
Developmental English
**Developmental Reading
Developmental Reading and Study
Developmental Reading and Study Skills
Developmental Services Instructional Lab
Developmental Skills Lab
Developmental Studies
Developmental Studies and College Skills
Directed Studies
Dynamics of Reading

Effective Reading
Effective Reading and Study Skills
Efficient Reading
English (given number)
Enrichment Reading

Flexible Reading
Fundamentals of Effective Reading
Fundamentals of Reading
Fundamentals of Reading and English

Improvement in Reading
*Improvement of Reading
Improvement of Reading and Learning Skills
Improving Reading Skills
Individualized Reading Improvement
Interpretive and Functional Reading
Introduction to College Reading

Language Skills
Learning Skills

Modern Reading Techniques

Power Reading
Pre-Tech Reading
Preparatory Reading and Writing
Programs for Achievement in Reading

Rapid Reading
*Reading
Reading and Basic Skills
Reading and Developmental Skills
Reading and Study Development
Reading and Study Improvement
Reading and Study Lab
**Reading and Study Skills
Reading and Study Skills Improvement

APPENDIX F (cont'd)

Reading and Writing Lab
Reading and Writing Workshop
Reading Better and Faster
*Reading Clinic
Reading Comprehension
*Reading Development
Reading Efficiency
Reading for Adults
Reading for Comprehension
Reading for Speed and Comprehension
Reading Fundamentals
**Reading Improvement
Reading Improvement and Developmemt
Reading Improvement and Study Skills
Reading Improvement and Vocabulary Building
Reading Improvement for Adults
**Reading Lab
Reading-Listening-Study Skills
Reading Program
Reading Skills
Reading Skills Improvement
Reading Speed Improvement
Reading Techniques
Reading to Build Skills
Reading-Writing-Listening
Readings in Communication
Readings On Focus
Readings on Issues
*Remedial Reading
Review Reading

Skill Development
Skills Development
Speed in Comprehension
**Speed Reading
Study Reading and Speed Reading
Study Skills and Reading Skills

Techniques of Reading

Vocabulary Building
Vocabulary Improvement
Vocational Reading Skills